

## REMARKS

Claims 3, 17 and 19 have been cancelled herein. Such cancellation is without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter of the cancelled claims. Claims 24-27 were cancelled in a prior response. Claims 1, 11-16, 18, 20-23 and 28-31 have been amended herein to further define Applicant's claimed invention.

Claims 1-2, 4-16, 18-23, and 28-31 remain in the application. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the last Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 9, 10 and 21-23 contain allowable subject matter, but were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicant kindly thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter and reserves the opportunity to pursue the subject matter of Claims 9, 10 and 21-23 as formerly pending prior to the present amendment.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC §112 as lacking an antecedent basis for "said frame." Applicant has amended Claim 1 herein to replace "frame" with "platform." Applicant thus submits that the rejection under 35 USC §112 has been overcome. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8, 11-21 and 28-31 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,817,800 to Williams et al. ("Williams"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 11, 28 and 31 herein to recite a system including "a filter paper card," which is the subject matter of former Claim 3 (now cancelled). Williams, in contrast, is directed to "a system for injecting or dispensing controlled volumes of fluid," particularly for use with a sterilizing chamber. (See Williams at col. 1, lines 6-9.) Williams does not teach or suggest a storage system including "a filter paper card" as positively recited in independent Claims 1, 11, 28 and 31. Applicant notes that the passage of Williams specifically cited by the Examiner to reject Claim 3 does not relate to a filter paper card, but rather to "a platen 72 which is adapted to receive a cassette 18." (Williams, col. 6, lines 31-33). The platen 72 of Williams is not the same as, nor analogous to, the filter paper card positively required by the present claims.


Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 1-8, 11-21 and 28-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Williams has been overcome. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicant submits that independent Claims 1, 11, 28 and 31 are patentable and that dependent Claims 2, 4-10, 12-16, 18, 20-23, 29 and 30 (which dependent directly or indirectly from one of independent Claims 1, 11, 28 and 31) are patentable at least due to their dependency from an allowable independent claim.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims, as amended, are patentable. Therefore, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider the outstanding rejections in view of the preceding comments. Issuance of a timely Notice of Allowance of the claims is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner if authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments relating to this application to Deposit Account No. 18-2055.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Joseph T. Leone, Reg. No. 30,492  
CUSTOMER NUMBER 25005  
DEWITT ROSS & STEVENS S.C.  
2 East Mifflin St., Suite 600  
Madison, Wisconsin 53703-2865  
Telephone: (608) 255-8891  
Facsimile: (608) 252-9243

I certify that this paper is being electronically submitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via the PAIR (Patent Application Information Retrieval) system on the following date:

Date of Submission: March 6, 2008  
Signature: Marcia Layton